REMARKS

Claims 1 - 10 remain active in this application. No amendments are currently made and no new matter has been introduced into the application. The continued indication of allowance of claim 2 is noted with appreciation.

It is initially noted that this application was filed on December 21, 1999, and will shortly have been pending in excess of five years. There have been *seven official actions and an advisory action* issued during the prosecution of this application. Accordingly, close supervisory review of this application under the provisions of M.P.E.P. §707.02 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 - 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by deGyarfas et al. (hereinafter "deGyarfas"). This sole ground of rejection in this application is respectfully traversed for the reasons of record and the further remarks provided below.

As previously pointed out, the invention provides a solution to the problem of adapting or modifying an interface in a computer system which may be associated with the operation and control of associated systems such as aircraft or other machinery and thus may be very expensive to operate. Moreover, the amount of the operator's attention required to modify the interface may be in excess of what is safe and prudent during the operation of the computer system and may involve the intentional or unintentional actuation of controls which may not be appropriate at that time for the associated systems.

The invention, as claimed, approaches this problem by inputting definitional tables which define the interface on the computer which is expensive to operate and on which, as a practical matter, the interface

cannot be modified (referred to in the claims as the "computing device providing said operator system interface") to a simulator (referred to in the claims as a "computing device other than said computing device providing said operator system interface") which can be inexpensively operated and which allows practical and safe modification of the interface. The interface is then simulated on the interface and modifications made and corresponding changes made in the definitional tables. The modified definitional tables are then, as claimed, loaded onto the "computing device providing said operator system interface" to reprogram the "computing device providing said operator system interface" to provide the interface as modified using the simulator.

While deGyarfas is arguably more relevant than other references which have previously been applied since it teaches two or more interconnected computers; one of which is a "glass trainer" which simulates a hardware environment and the other computer(s) are used to author the simulation, it does not answer the claims and, in fact, may have caused some confusion for the Examiner since deGyarfas does not appear to have been applied in a consistent manner in the Examiner's statement of the rejection.

Specifically, the Examiner's statement of the rejection indicates that by placing the system of deGyarfas into one of six disclosed modes, "the user is able to modify the graphics of the graphics workstation which can then be used by the simulator". It is respectfully submitted that this observation by the Examiner is diametrically opposite to the subject matter actually claimed and still fails to answer at least one the claim recitations of *providing, as an input to a computing device other than a computing device providing said operator system interface, definitional tables for said operator system interface,*

wherein said tables define specific governing
attributes of said operator system interface" (emphasis
added) or "generating an operator system interface
simulator program distinct from said operator system
interface, wherein, when the simulator program is run
on said computing device other than said computing
device providing said operator system interface, said
simulator program performs display of a representation
of the operator system interface defined by the
definitional tables input in the providing
step...thereby modifying said representation of the
operator system interface within said simulator
program" or "modifying said definitional tables to
correspond to said modifying of said representation to
reprogram said operator system interface on said
computing device providing said operator system
interface".

     That is, the Examiner has observed that deGyarfas
teaches *authoring or modifying* an interface and
displaying the interface so *authored or modified* on a
simulator but has apparently confused the functions of
the computer used as a graphics editor and the computer
used as a simulator. If the simulator or glass trainer
of deGyarfas is considered to correspond to the
simulator or computing device other than the computing
device providing the interface, as claimed, there is no
teaching or suggestion that any feature of the
interface can be modified from the simulator or glass
trainer of deGyarfas or that the graphics editor
computer of deGyarfas can be reprogrammed by transfer
of modified tables from the simulator or glass trainer
and the Examiner has not pointed to any passage of
deGyarfas as being relied upon for such a teaching(s)
or suggestion(s). On the other hand, if the Examiner
is proposing the converse; that the claimed simulator
or computing device other than the computing device
providing the interface, nothing is seen in deGyarfas

which corresponds to inputting the definitional tables which provide the interface of the "computing device providing the interface", nothing is seen in deGyarfas and the Examiner has pointed to nothing in deGyarfas which provides definitional tables as input to the "computing device *other than the computing device providing the interface*" so that the interface *so defined* can be modified.

Therefore, it is clear that there is no consistent reading of deGyarfas with can simultaneously answer even the most basic recitations of the claims and the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* demonstration of the propriety of the sole ground of rejection in this application. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the ground of rejection based on deGyarfas is respectfully requested.

It is additionally pointed out that deGyarfas also fails to answer the recitation of generating a simulator *program* for simulating the interface from the definitional table, as claimed. DeGyarfas *authors or modifies* an interface simulator program, itself, but does not generate any program which is distinct from the interface, as claimed, or, for that matter, any interface which is distinct from the simulator program. Likewise, nothing is displayed which is a *representation of anything else*, much less representing an actual interface. In deGyarfas, there is only a simulation program displayed in connection with different computers. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* demonstration of anticipation in regard to these features as well.

Therefore, in summary, it is clear that the Examiner continues to fail to address even the basic concept of the invention as recited by the claims and has completely failed to make a *prima facie* demonstration that *any* of the above-noted, clearly recited features are taught (or even suggested) by de

Gyarfas. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the sole ground of rejection based on deGyarfas is untenable and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Since all rejections, objections and requirements contained in the outstanding official action have been fully answered and shown to be in error and/or inapplicable to the present claims, it is respectfully submitted that reconsideration is now in order under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) and such reconsideration is respectfully requested. Upon reconsideration, it is also respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is therefore respectfully requested.

If an extension of time is required for this response to be considered as being timely filed, a conditional petition is hereby made for such extension of time. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall M. Curtis
Reg. No. 33,138

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P. C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, Virginia 20190

(703) 787-9400
Customer Number: **30743**